DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 861 08 CE 018 898

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE The Concept of Collaboration in Career Education. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 63p.; For related documents see CE 018 711 and CE 018 896
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01891-8)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Community Benefits; Community Coordinators; *Community Involvement; Community Organizations; Educational Benefits; Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Educational Problems; Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Policy Formation; *School Community Cooperation; *School Community Relationship; *School Industry Relationship; Seminars; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This monograph summarizes the thoughts, opinions, and experiences of the participants in the first three seminars of a series of thirty-three sponsored by USOE's Office of Career Education on the subject of collaboration in career education for grades K-12. After an explanation of the term "collaboration" in the introduction, the expected learner benefits from collaborative career education are outlined as well as the advantages for both educators and the business/labor/industry community. Two major problems are then identified: the private sector's refusal to recognize and accept responsibility in career education and the educators' refusal to allow the private sector to participate in operational policymaking. Next, suggestions are proposed for initiating a community collaborative career education effort, and discussion is devoted to the major actions required: (1) securing commitment from top community leaders and the community in general, (2) motivating teachers to learn about and use community resources, (3) sustaining the collaborative effort through a community education/work council and a collaboration coordinator, (4) financing the council's operations and coordinator's position, and (5) obtaining policy support statements from leading business, labor, and industrial organizations. Brief descriptions are included of collaborative efforts already underway by eleven community-based organizations and by the fifteen local career education coordinators who attended the third seminar. The two appendixes contain lists of the seminar participants and of the ninety-four issues raised by them. (ELG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164861

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

THE CONCEPT OF COLLABORATION IN CAREER EDUCATION

by

Kenneth B. Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

January 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, *Commissioner*

CE 018 998

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINCTON: 1978

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock No. 017-080-01891-8

PREFACE

During 1977-78, USOE's Office of Career Education, under contract with Inter-America Research Associates, conducted 33 two-day seminars (called "mini-conferences") on the general subject of "Collaboration in Career Education." Each seminar was limited to not less than 12 nor more than 16 persons. The purpose of each seminar was to provide examples of successful practices, advice, and suggestions to USOE's Office of Career Education helpful in fulfilling its continuing mission to provide conceptual clarification for career education.

The results of the first three of those seminars form the contents of this monograph. The first two seminars were called "conceptualizer conferences" as opposed to "practitioner conferences" and were thus aimed relatively more at accumulating conceptual thoughts than providing examples of actual practices. The third seminar had, as participants, 15 "practitioners" in career education representing 15 local communities where considerable collaborative action has already begun. When the thoughts of "practitioners" from the third seminar were examined, as represented by the seminar notes, it seemed evident that as much conceptualization had taken place there as in the previous "conceptualizer" conferences. Thus, all three sets of seminar notes are combined here.

The lists of persons participating in these three seminars appears as an appendix to this monograph. It can be seen that both education and the business/labor/industry community were represented by participants. Discussion was frank and spirited in each seminar—much more so than is apparent by the narrative summary that forms the content of this monograph. Limited copies of the complete "mini-conference" notes which I took and on which this monograph is based are available from USOE's Office of Career Education.

The concept of collaboration in career education was purposely limited in these seminars in two very major ways. First, no attempt was made to consider the entire community (and especially parents) as partners in career education collaborative efforts. Instead, prime concentration was placed on the business/labor/industry community as collaborative partners with education. In addition to parents, there is a wide range of community human services efforts that should be considered in a complete discussion of the topic. Second, these discussions were purposely focused primarily on the K-12 levels of education rather than also encompassing postsecondary education. This, too, was purposeful in that, to consider all of education would have made this initial

task too large. Readers should recognize both of these serious limitations which, when the total topic of career education is considered, will have to be corrected.

At various points in the monograph, I have inserted some of my own thinking on the subject. By and large, however, the contents of this monograph can be viewed as representing new knowledge that I learned from the participants themselves. Since attempts were made to include consensus judgments, no individual seminar participant can be held accountable for the contents of this monograph. Yet, in a very real sense, each can be considered a co-author.

The list of seminar participants appearing as Appendix A may, to some readers, prove to be a more valuable source of new knowledge than the contents of the monograph itself. So, too, may the complete lists of issues generated by seminar participants as recorded in Appendix B. I want here to express my personal thanks and appreciation to each seminar participant. Without exception, each made valuable contributions to the contents of this monograph.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the very great assistance given me by OE's contractor for this project, INTERAMERICA RESEARCH ASSOCIATES. The contributions of Dr. William Mermis, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville (who served as consultant to INTERAMERICA) in supplying me with process notes for each of these seminars was invaluable. So, too, was the fine organizational and logistical work performed by Dr. Brady Fletcher and Ms. Odie Esparza of the INTERAMERICA staff. Without their help, this document could not have been produced.

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

Introduction

The term "collaboration," when applied to American education, is defined here as a process involving shared commitment, responsibility, and authority between the formal system of education and various segments of the broader community for meeting identified learner needs. The basic assumptions inherent in the concept of collaboration include:

1. The term "education" includes much more than "schooling." Many learning opportunities for students exist in the broader community over and beyond those found in the formal system of "schooling."
2. It would be inefficient to try and impossible to succeed in an attempt to incorporate all community learning resources for students within the formal system of education; i.e., "schooling."
3. The educational needs of today's students cannot be adequately met by the formal system of education alone. To meet these needs demands that the learning resources of the broader community also be utilized.
4. The prime concern must center around the extent to which learner needs are met, not on which aspect of the community receives "credit" for meeting them.
5. Learners will profit most if various kinds of community learning resources are coordinated with those of the formal education system in ways that enhance and expand the variety and quality of learning opportunities for each individual.
6. Various forms of community learning resources can best help learners if they join forces, rather than compete, with the formal system of education. Our common concern for students should be sufficient motivation for doing so.

These assumptions hold implications for educational change, and for changing relationships between the formal education system and the broader community, that extend far beyond career education.[1] To those who embrace the concept of collaboration, career education can be viewed as a vehicle for use in implementing that concept. To career education advocates, the concept

[1] A good example of such implications can be seen in the Cultural Education Collaborative of Boston, Massachusetts that involves the use of such community learning resources as museums, art galleries, and the theatre to supplement student learning in understanding and appreciating music, art, and culture.

of collaboration is a basic, bedrock necessity required for the success of career education. Stated another way, the concept of collaboration could be endorsed and implemented in American education without necessarily endorsing career education. Career education, on the other hand, cannot be truly implemented until and unless the concept of collaboration is accepted.

Of all the implications for basic educational change inherent in career education, none looms larger than implications related to the concept of collaboration. This monograph discusses the concept of collaboration as it applies to career education. Readers should be aware of further implications for educational change as they read this monograph.

One further preliminary point must be made; namely, to recognize the need for learning resources over and beyond those available through the formal education system is, in no way, an indictment of the education system itself. On the contrary, the concept of collaboration rests on a basic sense of confidence and trust in the past, present, and future contributions of the formal education system. It seeks to strengthen, not to weaken, the effectiveness of the system.

Learner Outcomes for Collaboration in Career Education

Why is collaboration needed? What is collaboration in career education expected to accomplish? It is essential that initial answers to questions such as these be given in terms of *learner outcomes.* First priority must be placed on benefits accruing to students as a result of a community collaborative effort with the formal education system.

Students exposed to adult workers, other than educators, and to the physical resources of the occupational society itself, can, if this effort is carried out in a proper and appropriate manner, be expected to receive the following benefits:

1. A better understanding of the interdependence of occupations.
2. A more diversified set of opportunities for career exploration.
3. Improved attitudes toward work as a valuable part of society.
4. A better understanding and appreciation of relationships between work and total lifestyle patterns.
5. Improved ability to communicate effectively with adult workers.
6. An increased motivation to learn subject matter taught in schools.

7. A more complete and realistic understanding of how a business organization operates.

8. An increased understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system.

9. A better understanding of ways in which their personal skills and abilities relate to the community's need for workers.

10. A better understanding of the concept of competition in the labor market and stimulation to compete for jobs in the labor market.

11. A better understanding of the variety of career paths followed by adult workers during their working life.

12. An opportunity to use adult workers as role models for career decisionmaking.

In each of these ways, students who have been exposed to a collaborative career education effort can be expected to benefit more than students who have not. When these 12 student benefits are viewed in a global perspective, it can be seen that, basically, they amount to: (a) an increased realism regarding understanding of the occupational society; and (b) an increased motivation to prepare for and participate actively in the occupational society.

Hopefully, few will argue that such benefits are not desirable ones to seek for students. Many more are apt to contend that such benefits can and do accrue to students now through the efforts of educators alone and that a community collaborative effort is unnecessary in order for this to happen. The basic contention here is that the *quality* of such benefits can be greatly improved through a collaborative effort. While yet to be proven through experimental investigation, this contention is certainly susceptible to testing through research.

Process Outcomes for Collaboration in Career Education

Ideally, one would think that the need to provide students the kinds of benefits listed above should serve as sufficient motivation for both educators and members of the business/labor/industry community to work together in a collaborative career education effort. Unfortunately, in the "real world," the prospects of such student benefits must, for many, be coupled with an answer to the "What's in it for me?" type of question. Here, a brief summary of advantages of collaboration in career education for both educators and for the business/labor/industry community will be presented.

A community collaborative career education effort can be expected to provide the following potential benefits to educators:

1. Increased effectiveness of students in making the transition from school to work may result in greater community support for education.

2. Working with the community can help education better understand and respond to community needs.

3. A collaborative career education effort can help members of the broader community gain a greater understanding and appreciation of the problems educators face.

4. A collaborative career education effort can increase public understanding, acceptance, and endorsement of the goals of education.

5. Using community resources in a collaborative effort can help education increase its effectiveness without asking for large budget increases.

6. Increased understanding of the occupational society gained through a collaborative effort will provide educators with knowledge and insights useful in better motivating students to learn.

7. The use of community resources, through a collaborative career education effort, can provide variety in the teaching/learning process thus making teaching more meaningful to teachers and learning more meaningful to students.

8. A community collaborative career education effort can provide those educators desiring to become employed in the business/labor/industry community with knowledge and contacts that will be helpful to them.

A community collaborative career education effort can be expected to provide the following potential benefits to the business/labor/industry community:

1. A reduction in alienation of educators toward the nature and goals of the business/labor/industry community.

2. An increase in the quality of youth seeking to enter the occupational society.

3. Public relations benefits through helping both educators and students better understand the social need and desirability for your business.

4. Opportunities for the business/labor/industry community to tell its side of the story without the message being "filtered" through educators who themselves do not understand the private enterprise system.

5. The potential cost benefit ratios resulting from prospects of fewer school-alienated youth, unemployed dropouts, maintenance costs for juvenile delinquents, etc. makes a collaborative career education effort a good investment for business and industry.

6. A career education collaborative effort is a good means of encouraging volunteerism aimed at bettering lifestyles of employees.

7. A collaborative career education effort can help a given business get its message across to teachers and students whereas, without this, difficulties in gaining entrance to schools are often encountered.

8. Youth are future voters, stockholders, and employees. Its good business to pay attention to them.

9. A collaborative career education effort makes the expertise of educators available to industry for such purposes as:

   a. Assisting in career planning program efforts
   b. Developing internal career paths for employees
   c. Recruiting youth to meet EEO and affirmative action needs
   d. Sharing new educational technology
   e. Providing lifelong education programs for employees

There is, of course, no automatic assurance that any of these potential benefits will accrue to either education or to the business/labor/industry community. Realization of these potential benefits will depend heavily on the amount of expertise, the variety of resources, and the degree to which all parties involved are willing to trust, respect, and utilize the expertise of others. More than anything, it will depend on the extent to which educators and members of the broader community are willing to dedicate themselves to attaining the learner outcomes of collaboration outlined in the preceding section. As with most other societal problems, those who gain most will be those who give most.

Collaboration in Career Education: The Two Basic Problems

The preceding discussion has, hopefully, set the stage for identifying the two major problems to be solved if a successful career education collaborative

effort is to take place. Here, both problems will be identified and briefly discussed. Succeeding portions of this monograph will expand on portions of each.

Problem 1: To what extent is meeting the goal of education as preparation for work a responsibility of the business/labor/industry community? From an idealistic standpoint, career education advocates, in documents such as the OE monograph A PRIMER FOR CAREER EDUCATION, have contended that the business/labor/industry community must accept part of the responsibility for preparing youth for work in today's society. Such documents have sought to make sure the business/labor/industry community receives some of the credit if this goal is reached and some of the blame if it isn't. This kind of career education idealism hasn't, to date, been widely accepted by the business/labor/industry community. It has, in fact, often been resisted and rejected.

The arguments of those business/labor/industry persons rejecting the career education "idealistic" position seem to run like this:

> "Preparing youth for work is the responsibility of the formal education system. The business/labor industry community has a vital interest in the success of education in meeting this responsibility. Much criticism is due education now because of its lack of willingness and/or ability to adequately prepare youth for productive employment. The business/labor/industry community is willing to help education meet its responsibilities here but the responsibility itself remains with the education system, not with the business/labor/industry community. If education desires this help, it must tell the business/labor/industry community exactly what it wants it to do, for how long, and at what cost. The business/labor/industry community will then be able to respond in a specific fashion."

The problem here, of course, is part of the more generic problem faced by the business/labor/industry community today in meeting what some have called the "social responsibility of the private sector." The extent to which such responsibility is accepted will obviously influence such basic factors as corporate profits, dividends to stockholders, and, in the case of public utilities, rate justification statements made to regulatory bodies. That is, acceptance of such responsibility involves spending money. Such decisions obviously must be made at the highest levels of management. Part of the operational problem facing those who wish to implement collaboration in career education is that, at such top levels, the term "career education" has not yet generally surfaced. (The most notable exception to this generalization is found in the General Motors Corporation where a corporate policy on career education is in existence.)

Does the business/labor/industry community really have a "social conscience?" Educators attending the three seminars on which the contents of this monograph are based tended to answer this question, "no." Seminar participants from the business/labor/industry community tended to answer "Yes." Seminar participants seemed to agree that, if *collaboration* involving *joint acceptance of responsibility* is to occur at the community level, it may very well have to be initiated by *cooperation* between top executives from the business/labor/industry community and from education at the national and/or federal level. It is obvious that, to date, this has not yet occurred. Therefore, it remains in doubt whether or not this major problem will be solved.

Problem 2: To what extent are educators willing to share responsibility and authority for preparing students for work with the business/labor/industry community? Educators have, in general, appeared to accept the concept of collaboration philosophically but not operationally. The general attitude seems to be expressed in statements such as these:

> "We in education badly need the help and assistance of the broader community in preparing youth for work. We are grateful and appreciative when the business/labor/industry community is willing to open up its facilities and provide some of its personnel to help us with this task. All basic policy decisions, however, must remain with the local board of education. We are willing to listen to advice and suggestions from the business/labor/industry community, but we are not willing to allow them to participate as policymakers."

Two important points, made by participants in the third seminar, must be considered here; namely: (a) "Policymaking" must be considered at both the philosophical and at operational levels; and (b) there is a difference in meaning between the terms "participating in policymaking" and "making policy."

No seminar member argued in favor of taking responsibility for making the kinds of broad, philosophical policies that determine the goals, purposes, and basic structure of education away from local boards of education. School board members have an inescapable legal obligation to make such policies. Educators employed by school boards are obligated to administer school board policies. In doing so, however, those responsible for implementing school board policy are themselves faced with making operational policies. Such operational policies are increasingly based on expertise required for attaining specific learner outcomes as we move from the level of the superintendent of schools to the level of the classroom teacher. The making of operational policy permeates the entire education system. It is both influenced by and influences broad philosophical policies made by school boards.

At the program level, there are many operational policies that could and should be made utilizing the joint expertise of educators and of participants from the broader community. Examples of such operational policy questions include: (a) Should work experience for students be paid or unpaid? (b) What should youth see when they make a plant visit? (c) Should work experience be productive for employers? (d) What should youth know about the way a company operates? and (e) In what ways are subjects taught in schools related to tasks employees are performing? Until and unless the business/labor/industry community participates actively with educators in answering such operational policymaking questions, they can, in no way, be held accountable for results obtained from application of such policies in a career education effort. Without joint accountability, collaboration does not truly exist.

There are, of course, no hard, clear distinctions to be universally applied between what is "operational policy" and "philosophical policy." Distinctions are made at the local level depending on the composition of the school board, the qualities of educators, and the degree of trust and confidence placed in educators by school board members. Similarly, no clear or hard lines can be drawn between "participating in policymaking" and "making policy." School board policies are flexible, rather than rigid, in nature and are subject to change from school board meeting to school board meeting. Community representatives—especially those considered to be community leaders—can and do influence school board policies on a regular basis. That is not to say such community leaders actually make such policies because, of course, they do not.

Seminar members pointed out that, in a very real sense, school board policies do reflect community concerns in that school board members are elected by and so represent the broader community. While obviously true, this begs the question of whether or not community leaders should seek to influence school board members to adopt such broad philosophical policies as those that commit the school system to increasing its emphasis on preparing students for work or the extent to which the community itself is to be regarded as a learning resource for students.

In summary, seminar members argued for: (a) involving the broader community in operational policymaking for career education; and (b) encouraging the broader community to participate in actions aimed at influencing school board policies that endorse and support career education.

We turn now to suggestions of seminar participants for moving in positive directions toward effective career education collaborative efforts.

Suggestions for Getting Started in a Community Collaborative Career Education Effort

Participants in both the second and third seminars spent a considerable amount of time discussing the question of how a truly collaborative career education effort can be initiated. There was general, but far from unanimous consensus, that the initiative can originate in any part of the community—i.e., that it need not always originate from the education system. This view was championed most vigorously by educators in the seminars. Participants from the business/labor/industry community tended to feel it preferable, if not essential, that the initiative should come from the education system. A summary of other steps essential in starting such an effort on which apparent consensus was reached included:

1. Secure agreement among both educators and leaders from the business/labor/industry community that preparing students for work is a community responsibility extending beyond the education system itself.

2. Identify all possible community resources that might be brought to bear on solving the problem.

3. Ask the education system to coordinate its internal resources in ways that specify the kinds and amount of help needed from the broader community.

4. Arrive at some common understandings regarding conditions (including restrictions) under which various segments of the community can and should work together.

5. Formulate an initial action plan calling for specific roles and functions for various segments of the community.

6. Either utilize a Community Career Education Action Council established by the local board of education or establish a Community Education/Work Council and charge that body with responsibility for establishing and implementing operational policies for the action plan.

7. Appoint one person responsible for implementing the plan—preferably, but not necessarily, someone from the education system.

8. Put the plan into operation.

9. Evaluate the effectiveness of the effort, report back to all participants, and revise the plan accordingly.

Obviously, it is much easier to formulate a list of action steps than it is to follow through. The next several sections summarize recommendations of seminar participants with reference to several of these action steps.

Securing Community Commitment for a Collaborative Career Education Effort

The prime beginning point, emphasized by participants in both the second and third seminars, must be identification of a youth problem that both the education system and the broader community see as: (a) very important; (b) one they can help solve; and (c) one for which they have some definite responsibility. This general principle was seen as appropriate to any education/community collaborative effort. Examples of possible problems mentioned by participants that might possibly form the basis for such efforts include: (1) migrant youth in the community; (2) out-of-school, out-of-work youth; (3) youth use of drugs; (4) stereotyping as a community influence; (5) youth need for citizenship development; and, of course, (6) youth need to prepare for and actually enter the occupational society.

Of such possible problems, participants generally felt strongly that the problem of "Needed Changes in Education as Preparation for Work" was one that could, perhaps, most easily be used to generate a community/education collaborative effort. Such a problem topic would, in addition to career education, obviously include both vocational education and such programs as the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA). In spite of the fact that such a problem topic would necessitate considerable time to explain differences between career education and vocational education, participants seemed generally to agree this would be preferable to attempting to use "career education" as a topic area by itself.

Early involvement of the "thought leaders" in the community was considered to be essential by seminar participants. Lists of such "thought leaders" are kept by such persons as the superintendent of schools, the mayor, and the head of the local Chamber of Commerce. An early meeting of such "thought leaders" called by one of them will allow the business/labor/industry community input into setting initial priorities for collaboration. This is not to say that such a meeting can move quickly to identify the problem, the available community resources, or a beginning implementation strategy. On the contrary, participants seemed to agree that this "thought leader" activity may involve a series of meetings lasting up to two years in duration. The result, however, is considered well worth the investment of time in that it will have included all key segments of the community in setting priorities for collaboration and gaining commitment to a collaborative effort. There was good agreement that such a process is much preferable to any "canned plan"

that the superintendent of schools might bring to any particular segments of the community for consideration. The potential danger of the "canned plan" approach was especially emphasized in terms of the need to involve members of the minority community in establishing initial plans for collaboration.

In one of the seminars, a strong argument was made for the need to have some more broadly based organizational entity with an expertise and commitment to promoting community collaborative career education efforts at the local level. Such an agency could provide both the stimulus and the technical assistance required to both speed up and increase the effectiveness of community collaborative career education efforts. This concept is well illustrated by current operations of the California Industry Education Council that, operating out of central State headquarters, has stimulated and assisted in the creation of community collaborative industry/education councils of many California communities. Likewise, this concept can be seen in activities of the National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation that has helped to establish and continues to provide assistance to approximately 90 local councils in various parts of the country. The current operations of the National Manpower Institute in providing technical assistance to 20 local education/work councils is yet a third illustration of this concept in action. Certainly, there is a strong point to be made for establishing some mechanism at the State and/or national level that can assist local communities in such efforts.

Finally, participants seemed to agree that the establishment of local community career education collaborative efforts will be enhanced and made more effective if a strong leadership effort is present at the State level involving the Chief State School Officer and State leaders from the business/labor/industry community. It was noted that while, in some States, such strong State leadership is already present, it appears virtually nonexistent at the present time in other States.

In summary, participants seemed to be in general agreement on the following basic principles with respect to securing community commitment for collaborative relationships with the education system:

1. The process of collaboration can be applied to any problem for which the education system and the broader community share common concerns, expertise, and resources.

2. Collaborative efforts are likely to be more successful if limited to a particular identified problem. Once the collaborative process has evolved through attacking a particular problem, it can be applied to other problems.

3. The problem of preparing youth for work is a particularly appropriate one for use in initiating collaborative efforts at this point in time. This problem should be identified as extending beyond career education to include both vocational education and the new YEDPA legislation.

4. The process of problem identification and possible resources for solving the problem should be determined by broad community involvement, not simply presented to the community by the education system.

Operational Implications of Commitment "From the Top" to Collaboration

Participants were generally agreed that community collaborative efforts in career education must begin with commitment from top community leaders—including those of both leading community organizations and from top management of business and industrial firms in the community. They were quick to point out, however, that securing such commitment is of little value unless it includes provisions for encouraging collaborative career education actions at the operational level.

In terms of individual business/industry settings, this means providing those at plant sites both with the expertise for engaging in collaborative career education efforts and credit for doing so. If the president of a company instructs his/her employees to participate in collaborative career education efforts, some provision must be made for giving them credit when they do so. Unless employee accountability extends beyond simply production quotas to include participation in career education collaborative efforts, it is unlikely that, at the plant site level, much effective action will take place.

In the case of community organizations such as the local Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, NAB office, etc., collaboration must be sought in ways that take into account existing restrictions that prevent some such organizations from operating under the direction of some kind of community coordinating collaborative mechanism. It was pointed out that the charters of many such community organizations prevent them from agreeing to such arrangements in ways analogous to the need of local school boards to maintain autonomy in formulating school board policy. While such resources may be *added* together to make a total community collaborative effort, they cannot be *combined*. Participants seemed to be in general agreement that *coordination*, rather than *amalgamation*, of such community organizations should represent the ultimate goal of a community collaborative career education effort.

Internal Collaboration in Education: A Prerequisite for Community Collaboration

Participants in all three seminars agreed strongly that career education is a *concept* designed to permeate all existing educational programs rather than a new program to be added to all others. The classroom teacher, therefore, becomes the key person within the education system for implementing collaborative career education efforts. The three major problems identified by participants here were: (a) motivating teachers to use community resources; (b) helping teachers learn about the business/labor/industry community as a resource; and (c) helping teachers express the need for collaborative assistance in a clear scope and fashion. Each of these problems deserves brief discussion.

The following represent suggestions from participants in the third seminar for motivating teachers to participate in a collaborative career education effort:

1. Secure a board of education policy for career education. Teachers, as employees, are obligated to carry out school board policies. Unless such a policy exists, teacher participation in career education will be difficult to obtain.

2. Encourage the school superintendent to visit schools with an expressed goal of looking for career education in the classroom. Similarly, encourage building principals to announce and carry out their intention to visit classrooms for purposes of observing teacher career education efforts. Such actions on the part of school administrators will encourage teachers to act.

3. Encourage teachers and students who are engaging in career education to share their experiences with other teachers. Their positiveness and enthusiasm may "rub off."

4. Use parents and persons from the business/labor/industry community to encourage teachers to engage in career education. When teachers see such persons will give them credit for career education efforts, they may get involved.

5. Hold teachers accountable for career education learner outcomes in evaluation of teacher performance. Unless this is done, career education holds little hope of truly becoming a vehicle for basic educational change. THIS IS THE MOST CRUCIAL STEP THAT COULD BE TAKEN.

6. Make teachers aware, especially in large urban areas, of problems currently created by large numbers of out-of-school, out-of-work youth. Help teachers see how a career education emphasis may assist in reducing dropouts.

Participants agreed that good teachers will not need any of these "anxiety producing" mechanisms in order to engage in career education—i.e., they will do it voluntarily because they see their students need them to do so. They also agreed that, for the truly mediocre teacher, even the use of all of these "anxiety producing" mechanisms will probably not result in much change. At the same time, they felt the use of such mechanisms will effectively encourage many teachers to engage in collaborative career education efforts who, without them, might not do so.

It was recognized that a major reason many teachers don't make greater use of the business/labor/industry community as a collaborative resource for career education is that they know too little about that community. Among the positive suggestions for helping teachers learn more about the world to work outside of education, the following were made by participants:

1. Encourage teachers to participate in NAB and General Electric Career Guidance Institutes. Both were considered valuable by participants.

2. Establish training programs for teachers similar to those used by NAB and General Electric. The key elements are the quality of the training effort and finding some means to reward teachers for participating through giving them money and/or academic credit. Academic credit has minimal appeal to tenured teachers—and more and more teachers have tenure today.

3. Provide two- to three-day "work sabbaticals" for teachers under arrangements where substitute teachers take their place while they visit sites in the business/labor/industry community.

4. Where school board policy calls for all school administrators to spend "x" number of days per year in actual classroom teaching, use this arrangement to allow teachers to visit sites in the business/labor/industry community.

5. Use a "job fair" traveling van containing materials describing the business/labor/industry community. When that van is at a particular school, set aside time for teachers to study the materials it contains in addition to encouraging student use of such materials. Teachers have as much to learn from the contents of the "job fair" van as do their students.

6. Use a "most motivated for career education" approach that asks principals to pick the "most motivated" teacher from each building. Provide these teachers with 10 weeks of training, two hours per week, on how to use community resources for career education. Send them back to their building as the "career education building representative" and charge them with responsibility for showing other teachers how to use community resources.

7. Encourage local teacher associations to make "career education" a priority for inservice education. If such associations will endorse "using community resources for career education" specifically, it will be effective.

It is important to point out that each of the above suggestions represents a practice currently in use in one or more K-12 school districts, not theoretical "good ideas." While many more examples could obviously be generated, these should serve as examples of what can be and is being done now.

The most difficult challenge for internal career education collaboration within education obviously lies in the willingness and ability of educators to specify a scope and sequence framework for utilizing community resources. Participants in the first two seminars from the business/labor/industry community made it clear that they expect educators to say *what* they want community resource persons to do, for *how long*, and at what *cost*. These participants expressed considerable reluctance with respect to either their right or their ability to assist educators in the scope and sequencing aspects of collaboration.

Those local career education coordinators serving as participants in the third seminar seemed to have no difficulty in accepting this challenge. The general response they gave encompassed two basic principles: (a) the scope and sequencing effort should be built around the career development process—i.e., beginning with career awareness in the elementary school through career exploration to career planning and career decisionmaking; and (b) requests to resource persons should be formulated on a "need to know" basis rather than general process objectives. For example, they recommended against making a general request for help to students in "career planning and decisionmaking" because of a fear that attempts to meet such a broad request might simply result in recruiting efforts on the part of the business/labor/industry community. On the other hand, they gave, as examples of specific requests they might make, such things as:

1. Helping 11th graders learn how to construct a job resume.

2. Helping 12th graders learn how to apply for a job.

3. Helping junior high school social studies teachers learn basic concepts of the private enterprise system that should be incorporated into their curriculum.

4. Arranging field trips for elementary school students with different kinds of experiences planned depending on whether the purpose of the field trip was one of the following:

   a. Understanding the social contributions of the industry visited.

   b. Understanding the concept of interdependency of workers.

   c. Understanding how workers use basic academic skills in their work, etc.

Finally, participants in the third seminar emphasized that requests made to the business/labor/industry community for collaborative efforts aimed at increasing academic achievement of students should be put in the form of "competencies" rather than "literacy." That is, they considered it much more appropriate to seek assistance in the task of "helping students learn how to read the telephone directory" than if assistance were sought in helping students simply learn to read. They felt strongly that the clearest way in which community resource persons could help youth see the career implications of what they are asked to learn is if those things to be learned are stated in the form of functional competencies to be acquired rather than in the form of cognitive content.

Sustaining a Collaborative Effort: The Community Education/Work Council

How do partners maintain a "marriage" after the "honeymoon" is over? Participants in all three seminars recognized and addressed this problem at length in terms of community collaborative career education efforts. An answer common to all three seminars was that it is essential to establish some kind of community education/work council on a permanent operating basis. The controversy present was whether that council should be a part of the education system or an independent agency responsible to neither the education system nor to the business/labor/industry community—i.e., a "middleman" or "broker" whose main mission is bringing about better working relationships between these two segments.

Those arguing for making the education/work council an agency established under the authority of the local board of education emphasized that such an arrangement would:

1. Assume hard education dollars on a continuing basis. Without a hard line education budget item, the business/labor/industry community cannot count on the permancy of education's commitment to a collaborative career education effort.

2. If the Council is created by and reports to the board of education, it has a far greater chance of influencing school board policy than if it operated as a community agency independent of the board of education.

3. If established by board of education action, chances are enhanced that physical facilities (such as currently empty elementary school buildings) will be made available to house the council.

4. A community career education coordinator employed by the board of education can work most effectively with an education/work council if it, too, operates under the authority of the board of education.

5. Because the education/work council is established by the board of education in no way prevents it from receiving part—or even a majority—of its operating funds from the business/labor/industry community.

Those arguing for making the education/work council an independent community agency emphasized that such an arrangement would:

1. Establish a non-threatening forum not "owned" by any single segment of the community.

2. Allow a wide variety of community elements to "chip in" to supporting the Council and so feel they are *participating*, not just *cooperating*, members.

3. Allow the Council to remain problem/solution oriented and not tied to any particular *program* operating either within the education system or in the broader community.

4. Avoid any danger of standing with any of the collaborating participants *against* another of the collaborating agencies.

5. Maximize the number and variety of non-school based youth serving agencies in the community who are included as members of the council.

Those from both "sides" agreed that it is better to call the agency a "Community Education/Work Council" than to call it a "Community Career Education Council" because of the fact that the former term would include both vocational education and such community education/work efforts as those represented by the new YEDPA legislation and by existing community based organizations.

It is obvious that those on both "sides" have strong points in their favor. No attempt is made here to say that one is right and the other wrong. Rather, this should be a decision made by each community depending on all existing community factors. It can be expected that, in some communities, an education/work council operating under the authority of the local board of education may be the best possible direction to take while, in another community, the most feasible thing to do is to establish an independent community education/work council. It *is* a basic decision that must be made if a community collaborative career education effort is to be put on a permanent basis.

Sustaining a Collaborative Effort: The Position of Collaboration Coordinator

There appeared to be almost universal agreement that at least one person must be employed to work with the community education/work council on a fulltime, continuing basis if a sustaining community collaborative career education effort is to result. Such a person was seen as needed to perform the following functions:

1. To coordinate and bring together (a) school resources and (b) community resources so that there exists true coordination both *within* the education system and *within* the broader community.

2. To coordinate the "coordinated" education system and broader community so that "super-coordination" exists between these two "coordinated" elements.

3. To serve, in an operational way, a clearinghouse function bringing together and utilizing resources of both the education system and those of the broader community.

4. To be a creative, innovative, discoverer of new resources and ideas, problems, and strategies–i.e., to be more than a "maintenance person."

5. To serve as a catalyst to change through finding and using resources that exist beyond the local community level.

6. To provide balanced information about the community to both the education system and to members of the broader community.

7. To engage in inservice education for both educators and for persons from the business/labor/industry community.

8. To build and facilitate trust and respect among all community partners in the total career education collaborative effort.

9. To identify and highlight problems to be addressed by collaboration.

This is obviously an impressive list of high powered functions that demand skills–particularly process skills–of a highly sophisticated and knowledgeable individual. To discover and hold such a person, demands that consideration be given to employing her/him in some agency with a good salary base and an attractive pattern of fringe benefits. The position must be funded, either within the education system or in some community agency, on a "hard line" basis.

There was general, but far from unanimous agreement, that the person should come from a background in education and that the ideal place to house such a person would be within the education system. Those voicing such opinions argued that: (a) the expertise required for conducting inservice education among educators and for coordinating elements of the education system make it unlikely that a "non-educator" could be successful; and (b) unless the education system is willing to make a permanent commitment to such a position, the broader community will not see it as a continuing topic of interest.

While not disagreeing with these general principles, other seminar members pointed out that the most important qualities–interpersonal skills and knowledge of education/work relationships–may, in some communities, be found among persons from the business/labor/industry community, not among educators. There did seem to be general consensus that no necessary, automatic requirement that the person must be an educator should be imposed.

It is important to point out that, at no point, did seminar participants speak of this position as something to be created at the building level within the education system–i.e., one position or more for each school. On the contrary, the position was consistently pictured in terms of the total school system and the total community. This is consistent with provisions in P.L. 95-207, THE CAREER EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION INCENTIVE ACT of 1977, that calls for employing career education coordinators at the *school district level*, but not at the *building* level. Clearly, the seminar participants were not thinking in terms of the current EBCE (Experienced Based Career Education) model that calls for various specialists at the *building* level.

Sustaining a Collaborative Effort: Who Pays For It?

It's always easier to find verbal than to find financial support for a concept. No amount of verbal support can make a community collaborative career education effort happen unless funds are available to convert that support into

concrete actions. The preceding discussion has made it clear that funds are needed both to pay for operations of the community education/work council and to pay for the person occupying the position of coordinator of collaboration.

There seemed to be universal agreement that the local board of education must supply at least a part of the required funds. Difficulties are apparent immediately. Most school systems today are faced with continuing financial problems and a host of pressures to use their limited funds in a variety of federally mandated ways. Since there is no legal requirement that education funds be used to pay for career education—with or without a community collaborative effort involved—it is unrealistic to expect that boards of education in many communities will volunteer to do so on their own. Most K-12 school systems are currently faced with the necessity of initiating any new educational priorities through reallocation of current funds, not through asking voters to provide more funds for the school district.

Similar hard problems were apparent to participants when they considered implications of asking the business/labor/industry community to make a long-term commitment to a community collaborative career education effort. It was emphasized that the ability of the business/labor/industry community to support career education collaborative efforts financially must necessarily vary with the economic health of particular business/industry enterprises. It was further pointed out that most business/industrial organizations must be prepared to justify any expenditures to their stockholders in terms of long-run benefits to the enterprise. Some suggested that the only way a continuing commitment might be possible would be if there were arrangements for tax credits to be given to businesses participating in a community collaborative career education effort.

When faced with resolving these problems, participants pointed out that K-12 school districts can expect some financial assistance if the recently enacted P.L. 95-207—THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT OF 1977—receives appropriations. Under provisions of that law, school districts can employ career education coordinators at the community (school district) level even though they cannot do so at the building level. In addition, funds from this law may be used to support community collaborative career education efforts. While hopeful that such funds will become available, seminar participants generally agreed that the community "thought leaders" referred to earlier should encourage local boards of education to allocate part of the funds required to implement a community collaborative career education effort by using their current school budget. At the same time, participants suggested that a "community chest" approach, involving annual contributions from the business/labor/industry community might be generated to help pay the necessary costs.

A key question related to financing is whether or not the person employed by the K-12 school district as "Coordinator of Career Education" should also assume duties as "Community Collaboration Coordinator" (or whatever job title may be used). While collaborative efforts are obviously an important part of the job of a "Coordinator of Career Education," it is equally obvious that implementation of career education involves much more than working only on collaborative efforts. While this issue was not discussed in detail during any of the three seminars, a general assumption seemed to prevail that we are talking about only one position–not about two. Similarly, there seemed to be a general assumption that funds generated from the business/labor/industry community should logically be expected to be used to pay for part of the salary of the position with the remainder coming from local board of education funds.

The Need for National/Federal Leadership Effort in Collaboration for Career Education

The long-run success of nationwide efforts to influence change on the local community level is dependent on strong policy statements of support from the top. In the case of an effort such as collaboration in career education, this means strong policy statements of support from top leaders in business, organized labor, and industry coupled with similar statements from national leaders in education. Such top-level policy statements typically grow out of multiple successful local efforts, not vice versa. Participants seemed to agree that a sufficient number and variety of successful local community collaborative efforts in career education have now occurred so as to make the time appropriate to seek such top-level policy support for collaboration in career education.

At its roots, any such set of policy support statements from leading business, labor, and industrial organizations must involve:

1. A deep and abiding faith in the American system of formal education.

2. A conviction that, in America, a single system of education–including both public and private education–aimed at serving all of the children of all the people is preferred over a dual system of publically supported education that tends to create a class division among students.

3. A recognition that, among its multiple goals, the American system of education should include a strong and effective emphasis on the goal of education as preparation for work.

4. An acknowledgement that the goal of education as preparation for work cannot be fully met by American education without the active involvement of the private enterprise system.

5. A commitment to devote energy, resources, and funds required for the private enterprise system to join forces with the education system in a joint effort to better meet the goal of education as preparation for work.

These five statements form the bedrock for policy statements of support to be sought from top decision makers in the business, organized labor, and industrial segments of the private enterprise system.

It was further recognized that, on the education side, such strong statements of support are already present in the policy statements already adopted by such leading education associations as:

National Education Association
Council of Chief State School Officers
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Personnel and Guidance Association
American Vocational Association
American Association of School Administrators
National School Boards Association
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
National Association of Secondary School Principals

—and many more. In addition, the Congress has expressed its approval and support for career education through the recently enacted CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT OF 1977—P.L. 95-207--which carries clear provisions for collaboration with the business/labor/industry community. The solidarity of support from the education side has yet to be matched with similar solidarity of support, at the national level, from the business/labor/industry community.

During the second of these conceptualizer seminars, participants generated a number of action suggestions for moving further toward the goal of gaining top-level management policy support for a collaborative career education effort. Among the possible mechanisms for doing so, the following were endorsed:

1. OE's Office of Career Education should consider preparing a one-page briefing on career education to be mailed to top executives in business, labor, and management on a quarterly basis.

2. Top leaders in the business, labor, and industry communities who have already made a commitment to career education—e.g., General Motors, United Autoworkers, General Electric, United Rubber Workers, and AT&T—should consider hosting a series of informal luncheon meetings for their counterparts aimed at acquainting them with the concept of the career education collaborative effort and seeking their support.

3. Efforts should be increased to secure still more statements of support from other education associations and, especially, to encourage all education associations to agree on the basic concepts of collaboration in career education.

4. Efforts should be made to have the topic of career education placed on the agenda for the Business Roundtable and to enlist the support of its members for the career education collaborative effort.

5. The Secretary of HEW and/or the President of the United States should invite representatives from the Business Roundtable to discuss the topic of collaboration in career education.

6. Short, specific statements should be prepared for leaders in business, organized labor, and industry specifying exactly what they should commit their organizations to do in career education.

7. A strong effort should be mounted aimed specifically at seeking the advice and support of the many segments of organized labor in defining and implementing collaborative career education efforts.

Most of the participants seemed to feel that the initiative for such efforts should come from top levels of the Federal Government. It was pointed out to participants that, with the Office of Career Education being a very small part of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) and with USOE being a relatively small part of HEW, and with HEW being but one department in the Federal bureaucracy, it would be very difficult to expect that this could quickly or easily come about. The kind of national group that is both willing and able to carry out these suggestions was not readily apparent in this seminar.

Resources for Collaboration Represented by Seminar Participants

The preceding section must not be interpreted by readers to mean that no resources or action efforts now exist aimed at furthering broader community involvement in collaborative career education efforts. It should be made clear that the three seminars forming the basis for the contents of this monograph were the first in a series. The 15 seminars following these were each devoted to

a different community based organization now engaged in some kind of career education assistance to youth at the present time. Results from those 15 seminars will be reported in a later series of monographs.

Here, it seems essential to emphasize current resources for collaboration through (a) providing brief, thumbnail descriptions of collaborative efforts now underway by community based organizations represented in the first two seminars and (b) providing brief descriptions of current collaborative activities as reported by participants in the third seminar.[1]

IPAR is an organization in Portland, Oregon, funded primarily through the efforts of 169 business/industries in the Greater Portland area. Its basic purpose is to make the community a learning laboratory for youth through a collaborative effort of business, industry, organized labor, and education. The education system contributes a small portion of its budget each year. IPAR's Board of Directors includes representatives from education but is designed to be broadly representative of the community. It serves both as a clearinghouse for education/community collaborative efforts and as a stimulus and producer of new ideas for even more effective community career education collaborative efforts.

OPEN DOORS is a school/industry service in New York City sponsored primarily by the Economic Development Council that provides (a) lists of available B/L/I speakers for schools; (b) assistance to teachers in curriculum development related to economic education; (c) newsletters designed to foster communication and report collaborative efforts taking place between school systems and the broader community; (d) inservice workshops for teachers in which persons from the business/industry community serve as instructional staff; and (e) direct speaker services for schools from the business/industry community. As such, it is directly involved in educational change as well as in fostering more effective collaborative efforts between education and the business/industry community.

The NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN, funded jointly by the U.S. Department of Labor and by private industry, operates 130 offices across the nation as well as a national headquarters office in Washington, D.C. Its four major programs include: (a) a youth employment program aimed primarily at providing summer jobs for disadvantaged youth; (b) a Youth Motivation Task

[1]The organizations described here represent only a small sample of those involved actively in career education. Other outstanding corporate efforts such as those of the General Electric Company, America Cyanamid Corporation, Raytheon Corporation, etc. are not included here simply because it was not possible to invite representatives from such organizations to the seminar that formed the basis for this monograph.

Force that operates primarily as a speaker's bureau for school systems; (c) a College/Industry Relations Program concentrating primarily on assisting graduates from "non-mainstreamed" colleges complete effectively in the labor market; and (d) a Career Guidance Institutes program that provides inservice education in career education for teachers and counselors from K-12 school systems.

The INDUSTRY-EDUCATION COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA is funded primarily through contributions from California private enterprise. From its headquarters in Burlingame, California, the CIEC promotes and assists in establishment of local industry-education councils in a number of California communities. Operating primarily from a "we have problems right here in River City" approach, the CIEC effort seeks to identify a major problem of common interest to both the education system and to the broader community, to discover and marshall the community resources available for solving the problem, and to initiate action plans calling for collaborative activities. CIEC reports that career education is a useful vehicle in implementing this problem/process approach to change.

The EXECUTIVE HIGH SCHOOL INTERNSHIPS OF AMERICA, INC., now headquartered in San Francisco, California, operates programs in 30 cities in 18 States at the present time. It functions, basically, on a one-to-one basis under arrangements whereby senior high school students with potential executive ability are released from school for a semester to work with middle-management personnel in the private sector. As an unpaid career exploration/work experience project, students receive a full semester of credit toward high school graduation for participating.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RESOURCES FOR YOUTH, founded in 1967 by a small group of national leaders, currently assists over 1,000 Youth Participation Programs (YPP) throughout the United States. This effort operates from a basic assumption that youth's ability to participate fully and effectively as adult citizens (including participation in work) will be enhanced if, while still youth, they are provided opportunities to engage in meaningful activities designed to help others. It defines "youth participation" as involving youth in responsible, challenging action that meets genuine needs with opportunity for planning and/or decisionmaking affecting others. Participating youth work in hospitals, mental institutions, in industry, and in schools (where they serve as peer counselors and tutors).

The AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY employs approximately 300 educational representatives who direct and encourage the involvement of over 10,000 AT&T employees annually in working with educators. While the total set of activities ranges over a number of instructional

areas, it includes a heavy emphasis on collaborative career education efforts. It is an effort designed both to help education and to increase the economic efficiency and public image of AT&T itself. Approximately $7 million per year are devoted to this effort.

The UNITED AUTO WORKERS OF AMERICA employs approximately 35 Education Specialists nationwide in addition to a central education staff at UAW headquarters in Detroit. The UAW effort is a broad one aimed at improving all aspects of education and includes a clear emphasis on collaborative career education efforts. The UAW was the first major part of organized labor to adopt an official policy statement defining and endorsing career education.

The NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR INDUSTRY-EDUCATION CO-OPERATION is an organization involving members from both the business/labor/industry community and from the formal education system. Its primary purpose is to bring the marketplace and the education system closer together in a collaborative effort. Aimed primarily at encouraging and assisting local community efforts, NAIEC currently has a network of approximately 90 chapters now operating nationwide.

The GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION was the first major industry in the nation to adopt a general corporate policy statement endorsing career education. That corporate policy statement is currently being implemented in 121 GM plant cities across the nation. This significant career education effort is coordinated through the efforts of the Education Relations office at GM headquarters in Detroit. In addition to this operational career education effort, the GM Education Foundation—only recently established—plans to support other long-term career education efforts as well as other activities designed to aid American education.

The NATIONAL MANPOWER INSTITUTE, under a contract from the U.S. Department of Labor, is currently involved in improving the effectiveness of 20 education/work councils located in specific communities throughout the nation. These 20 communities were selected, based on a nationwide search, as being ones either where significant efforts at collaboration were already underway, or were just starting and showed real promise of taking hold. The emphasis of these education/work councils typically covers the entire goal of education as preparation for work and so includes vocational education as well as career education. An important part of the NMI effort is the establishment and operation of a national communications network aimed at helping communities interested and involved in collaborative education/work efforts learn from each other.

In addition, the third of these seminars had, as participants, 15 persons currently serving as local career education coordinators or as local education/work council professional staff persons. Each was asked to write a brief description of their current collaborative efforts in career education. Their statements are reproduced here as written by these participants:

Nancy Losekamp (Upper Arlington Public Schools, Ohio):

In Upper Arlington, we have established a Career Education Advisory Council which meets bimonthly. In addition to serving in an advising capacity, these members complete tasks based on need through ad hoc committees.

To date much collaboration is done on a personal basis. This role is a large portion of my job as director and that of a few select people on my staff. For example, I was invited to chair the Committee on Career Education for our newly established Chamber of Commerce. I also worked very closely with Rotary and some with Kiwanis. We are now working with G.E. Industry in Education and Guidance Programs through our strong link established with the Ohio State University. I have a staff member on the Board for Explorer Scouts, one working with NAB and one working with Junior Achievement.

I also work with vocational education and with community education. I guess I haven't begun to list all collaborative efforts. We as a district are moving toward more collaboration and responding to needs of the community.

I must say that it is my personal belief, and I believe that in my district, that education is responsible for educating—we are supporters of reform, but we must make the decisions and be held accountable for them. Schools were established for a reason. I believe we must have help—reach out—ask, beg, etc., etc. But we must lead. I don't think I have a problem with power or turfdom. I believe education has the responsibility and must accept it.

If I am ill, I go to a physician and he may call in consultants, but it is his job to treat me, not a lawyer or someone else.

I really can't write clearly, but perhaps my definition of collaboration is different than most, I'm not sure. I'm willing to work to all ends to involve many, give them credit for doing, but not giving up control.

Ms. Barbara Preli (Jefferson County Public Schools, Kentucky):

1. Advisory Council–15 members–all cluster representatives

A. Tasks of Subcommittees

1. teacher internships
2. student internships
3. curriculum review and input
4. community survey of resources
5. renew and input of training of school staff
6. public relations–public awareness of the program–assistance on pamphlet and slides
7. P.T.A.–collection of pictures, inc., for local school
   P.T.A.–assistance in local school survey
   P.T.A.–joint parent orientation local school
8. Jaycees–Speakers Bureau
9. Volunteer–recording cassettes interview of persons in jobs which are difficult to release time to come to the classroom
10. work experience–students

B. Parents–Home

Groups of parents have participated in 6-week, 3-hour discussion groups on career education.

Nick Topougis (Akron Public Schools, Ohio):

Our collaborative efforts are described in the most recent manual, "Flight Plan: Toward a Career Choice", in much more comprehensive views than I can begin to describe in 1½ pages, however, since you asked, I'll try to summarize.

There are several areas of collaboration that we are identified with: First, our in-service and staff development programs bring together the best thoughts in planning and implementing, of local career educators, university personnel and members of the business, industry, and labor community. Staff development not only includes university courses but also building level in-service, business and labor seminars and summer communities work experienced programs.

We are presently working jointly in the implementation of several national programs with personnel and staff from the educational sector, Boy Scouts of America, Junior Achievement, National Alliance of Businessmen,

AFL-CIO, Human Resources Development Institute, American Society for Personnel Administration, General Motors and Labor Education Advancement Program under the sponsorship of our local Urban League.

We have established, improved and expanded collaborative programs that relate to teaching career concepts into the subject content area with many of our major businesses, industries and labor organizations that focuses on economic understanding, field experiences in career exploration as well as awareness.

An organization which brings together school, businesses, industry and labor personnel for career education planning and implementation, is the Akron Regional Development Board. An ARDB staff member works extremely close with career educators in expanding our collaborative activities. In addition, the ARDB Business Education Work Committee assists educators to identify sources of assistance and obtain community resources support in identified program needs. Our Labor Council provides similar assistance with the major goal being to increase students and teachers' awareness of organized labor's role in the economy and society. Efforts are currently proceeding under a joint sponsorship of the career education program and the local labor council. They include identification of speakers on topics related to organized labor and identifying sites for field observations of workers.

David D. Amerman (Livonia Public Schools, Michigan):

Collaborative Efforts Being Implemented

Collaborative efforts to improve career education in the Livonia community are coordinated and facilitated by the Livonia Area Industry Education Council composed of 27 representatives from business, industry, labor, government and education. The Council provides an arena in which joint efforts by these community segments, aimed at providing meaningful career education experiences for youth, be orignated and/or facilitated.

Some examples of collaboration between education and the business/industry/labor/government communities are:

1. The Council serves as the general advisory committee for school district vocational education and provides members for 21 craft committees.

2. 600 Employees participate in the Cooperative Vocational Education program, employing 750 students.

3. Forty business firms provide high-level management experiences for 60 talented high school students who are released from formal schooling for a semester with full academic credit.

4. Twenty dentists provide field experiences for students in training as dental assistants.

5. A Youth Employment Service is jointly funded by the City of Livonia, the Livonia Chamber of Commerce and the Livonia Public Schools. It is housed with and monitored by the Livonia Industry Education Council.

6. Forty-five teachers and counselors are being trained under an Office of Career Education contract to develop collaborative activities with community resources.

7. One thousand, five hundred students are participating in a three-year service learning project which is attempting to demonstrate that the application of skills and knowledge learned in the the classroom to volunteer service to various segments of the community attitudes and increased academic achievement.

8. **Junior Achievement** provides local businessmen who teach economic and career education to junior high school students one hour per week for 18 weeks.

9. Fifty local businessmen provide paid work experience to 100 alienated junior high school youth.

Ernest Upthegrove (Dade County Public Schools, Florida):

On March 17, 1977, the School Board approved a Five Year Master Plan for the Implementation of Career Education. They did not approve the accompanying budget but approved the funding of the Master Plan as a high priority.

This action was the culmination of ten years of collaboration—collaboration in the internal educational community and collaboration with the external community, both equally important.

It is agreed that full implementation of this plan will come from four major funding sources:

1. Reallocation of existing school budget and resources
2. Community resources
3. State funds
4. Federal funds

Collaboration consists of both formal and informal levels of involvement and cooperation.

The formal includes: Career Education Advisory Committee, Coalition for Career Education, Chamber of Commerce Career Education Task Force, and a Career Education Employability of Skills Advisory Committee.

The major concern is specific assignments. What can we do for effective utilization of these community resources.

Carolyn Raymond (Mesa Public Schools, Arizona):

The career education concept and its implementation as currently involved in the Mesa Public Schools (serving over 31,000 K-12 students) has followed initially a loosely knit approach to community career education collaboration and now utilizes a more formal approach to its collaboration. This community involvement no doubt came as a result through the impetus of a town hall meeting in the late 60's which gave a mandate to the educational system to make certain changes in some of its learner outcomes. These outcomes have now materialized as part of the career education concept in the system.

Currently, collaboration comes in many ways and its major thrust comes from the Mesa Career Education Business-Industry Council. This council of approximately 30 members meets monthly to serve in several ways. The council functions under a constitution with several committees each of which has formal action plans (MBO's).

Initially the council was set up to assist in the development and operation of a Community Resource Service. This agency serves as a clearinghouse in providing human resources from the community in linking the world of education and work. The Community Resource Service provides logistical service to educators in such areas as: site trips, career speakers, title lectures, video tape interviews, vehicle display days, career seminars, technical advisors, career observation and exploration expenses. The council assists in recruiting and training community resources for this clearinghouse. Once this organization was established, the council has become increasingly involved in numerous activities including:

- conceptualization of new services for the clearinghouse agency to handle

- advising on current needs of the working world and suggestions for revising the education program of youngsters to meet these needs

- conducting activities which promote the concept of career education and community collaboration. (i.e., conduct bi-monthly career tours, coordinate a speakers bureau for PTO, PTA, service, church organizations, etc.) conduct community updates of career education in the schools, arrange for media coverage of activities

- identify current and long-range issues and possible solutions to education/community problems

- sponsor specific programs in the schools (i.e., parent/adult shadows), building level career liaisons (part of existing faculty), parent study sessions, work experience programs, volunteers programs)

- Serve as trainees and participants in staff development activities

- participate in steering committees, problem solving groups, etc.

The council is the major influence on the board of education in assisting them in establishing policy as it relates to career education. They have also collaborated with other groups which have programs or approaches that have as their intent the purpose of assisting youngsters in preparation for work.

It was this group, for instance, which helped conceptualize and support the request for funds to establish a community education/work committee through the National Manpower Institute. The chairperson of the council serves on this committee along with the school's career education director. This committee has as its major focus that of acting as a catalyst to link in a collaborative way all community agencies, institutions, etc., with education being one of these agencies which can facilitate youth in their transition into economic adulthood. They have linked with the National Alliance of Businessmen in conducting leadership and career guidance institutes. Members serve on the Arizona Education Business Industry Council. The council recently has assisted the schools in linking one of their existing student exploration programs with the YEDPA program.

Catherine P. Hopkins (Worcester Public Schools, Massachusetts):

Collaboration in Worcester, Massachusetts, is multi-leveled and multi-faceted. The membership of the Worcester Area Career Education Consortium includes the Worcester Public School Superintendent, an Associate Superintendent (R&D), and the coordinator of career education, as well as leading business, industry, and labor people. This group is concerned with support for and implementation of career education activities and

implementation of career education activities for all school children–public, parochial, vocational, private. It is also concerned with CETA programs, youth unemployment and the changing world of work.

In addition to this work-education group, collaboration between community and education exists from the neighborhood "Mom and Pop" to big business to museum (e.g., Sturbridge Village, History of Work Project) for the purposes:

- of providing students and staff with first-hand knowledge and experience in a variety of work settings through internships, "shadow" experiences, field trips, etc;
- of assisting teachers in curriculum development in basics as well as economic areas;
- of facilitating the development of Learning Activity Packets and guidance "survival" kits (job hunting, securing and maintaining materials);
- for enchancing teacher in-service with community representatives as instructional staff;
- of providing insurance to cover children in the community engaged in career education activities;
- of serving on task forces and advisory boards related to career education;
- of providing updated labor and employment data;
- of providing in-service training to staff of contiguous towns as each initiates career education activities;
- of building educational relevancy in the classroom.

Vincent Troiano (New York City Board of Education):

New York City over the years has effected a myriad of programs involving the community in the educational process. In outline form:

- Career Guidance Institutes designed to give the educators an opportunity to directly experience the world of work;

- In-service courses taking teachers, counselors, supervisors, administrators to 15 different types of work sites;

- Publishing Activities Centers–a collaboration among educators, The New York Times and Gestetner which enables children in grades 2-6, in 195 schools, to design, write and produce their own publications;

- Comprehensive math and science program which prepares in-school youth for pre-engineering studies. A collaborative effort involving the National Science Foundation, Exxon, local colleges and engineering firms;

- More than 10,000 students involved annually in cooperative education programs;

- Work study program with: municipal hospitals, botanical gardens, environmental projection, boy and girl scouts, and oceanographic agencies;

- More than 45 different advisory commissions;

- Continuum programs bridging the gap between secondary and post-secondary education;

- Thirteenth year–pre-apprenticeship programs in six different occupational areas.

The list is unlimited. However, the broadest effort is the relationship between the Economic Development Council, the National Alliance of Businessmen, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Board of Education Agencies, namely the Center for Career and Occupational Education.

The Economic Development Council is responsible for the success of its program, "High School Renewal." Members of the "community" assist high schools in effective management techniques which includes planning, budgeting, research, followup and in establishing and attaining measurable objectives.

Open Doors, an arm of this alliance, moves toward the goals of career education by serving as an urban economic and educational resource to teachers, counselors, and administrators by developing curriculum materials about commerce, industry, finance, labor, law and other aspects of the economic environment.

The collaboration is best exemplified by the project labeled ABLE: Alliance of Business, Labor, and Education. This group was organized to meet the need of collaboration by examining problem areas, determining needs, establishing priorities and setting objectives. The four immediate objectives of ABLE are:

1. Improve communications through a clearinghouse among all relevant community organizations;

2. Identify inadequacies in the preparation of students for work;

3. Assist in the development of initiatives to prepare students more adequately for the world of work;

4. Initiate efforts to expand work exploration and preparation for students.

All of the above are a smattering of the many programs presently in effect New York City. A comprehensive list is available upon request.

Dean Wertz (Bloom Heights High School, Illinois):

The career education system operated by the "Case" Elementary Co-op and Bloom High School includes collaboration of both business and industry representatives as well as parent volunteers. Our system includes career oriented activities for K-3, 4-6, 7-8 in a design best suited for the classroom teacher. In addition to the classroom materials, we send every K-8 teacher a monthly copy of our "Career Factivities" (K-3, 4-6, 7-8) including fresh new ideas, student work sheets and a reminder of help available from our "Case Career Resource Center" staff. Our staff includes two elementary teachers-on-loan who handle (1) staff inservice and follow-up, (2) 'make-and-take' career education material sessions (3) development and rewriting of all published materials, and (4) the coordination of our 'collaboration' effort. They locate, schedule, and evaluate business/industry representatives and parents who serve as classroom speakers or career day participants.

Joseph W. Richards (Salt Lake City, Utah):

Collaboration to Promote Career Education in Salt Lake City

The State board of education has just adopted new graduation requirements for high school students. During the 7th and 8th grade years, each student must plan educational goals that relate to career planning. The goals are to be revised as needed each year as the student goes through high school. By

graduation time, a student knows what the next steps should be to get employment or to get additional postsecondary education before paid employment.

During one of the four semesters of the 11th or 12th grade, a student must become involved in a cooperative education program or he/she must do volunteer work for 90 hours. The State education agency does provide both State and Federal funds to help finance career and vocational education programs. There is very good collaboration between the local and State education agencies.

The four local education agencies in Salt Lake County have collaborated with businesses, industries, and communities to form a partnership to provide:

- classroom career speakers plant/office tours and discussions, and "shadowing" (observing a worker on the job);
- internships (unpaid work) and career reference materials.

During the 1976-77 school year, there were 1,672 contracts. There were 34,826 students reached by the contracts.

The Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce sponsored a Career Fair for elementary and secondary students. The local service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs, give their services to the schools.

In Salt Lake City, there is a good collaboration among State and local educators, intra- and inter-district collaboration, and the collaboration of business, industry, community and service clubs.

Don Schurr (Alma, Michigan):

"Collaboration" as Defined by the Gratiot Experience

Collaboration at the K-12 level as experienced by the Mid-Michigan Community Action Council in Gratiot County, Michigan, is seen as a multi-faceted process. The MMCAC serves as an originator, a facilitator, and an implementer of career and economic education by functioning as a liaison between four major groups.

(1) Government (primarily on a county and local level)
(2) Business and industry located within the county
(3) Labor organizations in the county
(4) Education (again mostly dealing on a county level with six school districts)

There is currently within Gratiot County no other established mechanism in the four areas mentioned set to work with career education, as a multi-faceted collaborative effort. Therefore, the MMCAC has assumed as its role the bringing together of these four areas to bridge the gap between the world of work and of school for students at the K-12 level. Collaboration as defined by the MMCAC must be an active process, as evidenced by very visible, tangible programs and not just passive dialogue or pure policy formulation. Second, it must involve a genuine partnership of business, etc., not the traditional pattern of school dominance. This leads to a greater sense of non-school accountability and more genuine community involvement.

To accomplish this kind of collaboration, the MMCAC takes an active role in not only origination of career education projects but in day to day implementation. Resource sharing,—in large part to sharing of volunteer time among school districts—is one important aspect of community collaboration. There is a corresponding need for shared responsibility within the non-school community. The MMCAC reinforces resource sharing on both levels. The Board has stressed the importance of being able to demonstrate tangible, show me, results of career education projects and ideas. Therefore, a critical evaluation system is necessary to study the results of the programs(s). Ritual programmatic functions involving representatives of all segments of the community and the students serve two purposes:

(1) Heighten the sense of community, that all are working toward a common goal;

(2) Also help expose what is being done on a broad basis and keep volunteers from thinking that their participation is an isolated incident.

At the heart of the collaboration among any group is money. Thus, the MMCAC draws on all sectors of the community for a balanced formula: using the principle of 1/3 from business, 1/3 from education, 1/3 from government. Schools represent a $.50 per student assessment for each of the six county districts. The third from government has been pledged by the county commission and the final third is raised by business, industry and individual donations. Thus, all segments of the community have a share in the funding mechanism and no one element of the community can claim to dominate either financially or programmatically.

The Mid-Michigan Community Action Council further advances collaboration by helping to establish new programs where needs are identified and concerns are voiced. This ranges from efforts to stimulate countrywide economic expansion in general to specific employment programs for youth.

Collaboration as practiced by the MMCAC is the process of acting to promote dialogue from all sectors of the community and to facilitate action to create benefits to students K-12 and the local economy. The end goal is to bridge the gap between school and work in such a way as to encourage similar patterns of collaboration elsewhere in the community: with the conviction that cooperation on one level breeds more cooperation and interaction (collaboration, if you will), throughout the community on various levels.

Albert Glassman (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania):

Collaboration in Philadelphia

Philadelphia enjoys an unusually high level of business, industry, labor, government, and non-profit agency collaboration in its career education programs–much of it considerably long-standing. The Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, in tune with its national parent organization, has been instrumental in marshalling much of this support and in developing an understanding of the CE movement within the business community.

The Chamber worked closely with school district CE staff in the development of our key instrument in the collaborative process–the Advisory Council for Career Education. Now beginning its four active year, ACCE is an outgrowth of a traditional and long-standing advisory council for vocational education organized in response to legislative mandates ostensibly for the purpose of assisting school district vocational personnel in the design and evaluation of vocational training programs.

Given the initiatives being undertaken in career education in our schools and an adminstrative reorganization that resulted in a Division of Career Education that absorbed the entire vocational education support system, it seemed wise to a number of us to move in the direction of an advisory group for career education.

ACCE is composed of some 35 representatives of the aforementioned sectors of the community. For the most part, they are individuals holding major posts within their respective organizations. Its outgoing chairman, appointed by the Superintendent, is John Geisel, Manager of Corporate Affairs, Rohm and Haas Company; the incoming chairman is Harry Williams, Supervisor of Public Relations for Bell of Pennsylvania.

The parent advisory council is divided into seven permanent subcommittees. Each begins the working year with an action agenda and produces a report of its activities with specific recommendations. Each subcommittee

chairperson recruits subcommittee members primarily from outside the ranks of ACCE, thereby broadening the B.I.L. representation in the advisory process. The subcommittees are: vocational education (a committee that directs the activities of 13 occupational cluster communities), long-range planning, staff development, Federal and State funding, employment, special education, and the "Education/Work Council."

The latter is a recent development and promises to become a most important agency for collaboration. ACCE recently secured a $50,000 planning grant from NMI to develop a local education/work council. Consequently, Philadelphia is a member city of a 21 city national consortium seeking to develop new local initiatives designed to ease the transition problems of youth. The Education/Work Council is representative of every major youth serving agency in the city, and in a few months of its existence, has established a substantial reputation for vigor and productivity. It has been especially helpful in the process of implementing the new Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1976. It is especially important to note that the Education/Work Council is a sub-agency of the Advisory Council for Career Education. The DOL grant to ACCE is indicative of their high regard for the collaborative process in Philadelphia being spear-headed by that organization.

Another important example of effective collaboration is the cooperative school district–Urban Coalition high school academies program. Currently, four such academies are flourishing in as many inner-city high schools–an Academy of Applied Electrical Science, an Academy of Automotive Services, and two Business Academies. In each case, business, industry, and labor, collaborate with school district personnel in the design, support, and delivery of the educational program. Here is an example of collaboration where we have achieved cooperation in decisionmaking, major financial support from the cooperating consortium and shared responsibility for program success. And it is this level of collaboration that is, in my view, ultimately essential if career education is to flourish. Collaboration has to be more than advice-giving, more than the creation of advisory councils. To me, it means shared planning, shared decisionmaking, and shared accountability. This is a large order for the B-I-L community and for school personnel as well, but there are examples of this process, as in our academies program.

Irv Moskowitz (Denver Public Schools, Colorado):

Career Education Center

Collaboration between the Denver Career Education Center staff and the community at large take form as a result of the problem at hand. Philosophical and conceptual issues are dealt with long standing groups that use in depth problem solving practices. Specific (perhaps one time only) problems are jointly attacked by staff and community people on a short term basis. Between these two approaches for community/school collaboration are a variety of less extreme practices. In chart form, these represent a ***sampling*** of cooperative school/community ventures:

COMMITTEE/COUNSEL	CHARGE	MEMBERSHIPS	DURATION
Central Advisory Counsel	Provide direction and monitoring of all major CEC education functions	25 citizens from industry, labor, business and professions as well as students and parents	Ongoing
Craft (trade) Advisory Committees	Provide guidance for the teaching/learning process in the vocational programs (To include curriculums and equipment specification)	Tradespeople, employers, and and labor representatives	Ongoing
Professional Seminar Committees	Plan, develop, and help operate Professional Seminars	Practicing professionals, university staff, and high counselors	Two months per year
Committee on Coordinating Senior Citizen/CEC Activities	Brainstorm then trouble-shoot means for opening CEC resources to seniors	Community leaders and workers involved in senior activity programing	Two sessions (planning and evaluating)

These are but a representative sample of the involvement of over 250 community people with CEC (one building) programming.

Norman Malbin (Portland, Oregon):

A wide array of collaborative activities are taking place in every major metropolitan area in America today; Portland is no exception. My comments are restricted to two such efforts:

THE GREATER PORTLAND WORK-EDUCATION COUNCIL

The GPWEC was established in August of 1977 as one of the 21 communities in the National Manpower Institutes Work-Education Consortium Project. The Councils mission is to improve the school-to-work transition process. To achieve this mission, key individuals from government, education, business, labor, industry, civic groups and others involved in the transition process have been brought together; this group will work collaboratively to develop and promote effective work-education transition policies.

The Portland Council has identified nine key aspects of the transition process to work on in order to improve the overall process. These are, not in order of priority: 1) Occupational outlook and career information reporting systems; 2) Career guidance; Opportunities for work/service experience; 4) attitudes toward work; 5) Laws, practices and customs; 6) Definition of "basic education"; 7) Government policies and programs; 8) Availability of information about educational and training programs and jobs and 9) Barriers faced by specific groups of youth due to their particular status in life (i.e. sex, minority, handicapped, poor).

The Council is systematically reviewing each of these areas, identifying what the major issues/problems within each area are, identifying areas of agreement or disagreement (on both problem definition and proposed resolutions) and is working together to develop mutually desirable solutions. As far as I'm concerned, this is collaboration of the first order.

The Portland Council has approximately 20 members. It is a voluntary, self-established unincorporated body. (The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory serves as the Councils fiscal agent.) The Council meets monthly, on Saturday mornings, for three hours. Aside from the formal collaborative process described above, the Council meetings provide an open forum for members to share mutual needs and concerns.

It is noteworthy the Portland Council neither administers nor serves in an advisory capacity to any program on an ongoing basis.

THE USOE CONSORTIUM PROJECT

Responding to an offering by the U.S. Office of Education, Portland Public Schools received a contract: "Strengthening Educations Participation in the Work-Education Consortium Project." The primary objectives of this project are to improve the understanding and attitudes of educational personnel toward career education and the concept of collaboration and to cause an increase in the use of community resources by education personnel.

The Greater Portland Work-Education Council recognizes this as a strong collaborative effort and actively supports it. This project is a joint effort by six organizations: three local school districts (who are providing the teachers and support staff); the Institute for Public Affairs Research (I-PAR) and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (who have joined forces to use their collective expertise for training) and the Council (which provides the overall coordination). Together, these organizations are working with 65 teachers and ten administrators to find new ways to utilize the broader community in the educational process.

Myrtle E. Hunt (Pinellas County, Florida):

PCEC: Community Collaboration Through Involvement

The Pinellas County Career and Economic Education Committee was formed in June, 1976, to develop and validate a system for planning, implementing and evaluating programs of career, economic, and community education. The organization was designed to allow lay citizens, representing a broad variety of interests, to interact with school board members, the superintendent, central administration, teacher organizations, and local postsecondary institutions. This committee believes that broad cross-sections of people in Pinellas County must plan jointly to improve the quality of education offered in the district in order to better equip both children and adults for the world in which they must live.

Committee members, organized into ad hoc task forces, attempt to deal with ten major objectives requiring close school-community collaboration: (1) knowledge of occupations, (2) knowledge of the economic system, (3) guidance for realistic career decisions, (4) employability entry skills, (5) alternatives for early school leavers, (6) student worker contacts, (7) staff development, (8) placement and followup services, (9) curriculum review, revision, and validation, and (10) test development and validation through formal evaluation.

Committee membership (one-third educators and two-thirds business, labor, industry representation) provides a broad base of community support. Expertise in any area of need is readily available. A phone call to the chairperson will provide quick access to these services. Requests for service, generated in either the schools or the community, are coordinated by seven members of the Executive Task Force. This task force is made up of representatives from business, industry, labor, community organizations, professional groups, the board of education, the superintendent, office of, career education, and postsecondary institutions.

The system is designed to generate interest, support and motivation. As a result, a variety of benefits accrue to teachers, students, administrators, and the community as a whole. Teachers and other school staff use committee resources to motivate students toward school-related, career-relevant tasks. Data generated through evaluation and follow-up services are used to revise subject matter and to help teachers become more aware of community attitudes and priorities.

1. Schools should serve their community;

2. Students should leave senior high school with some preparation for becoming productive members of society;

3. People from all areas of society should be involved with educational programs, from development to evaluation.

Pinellas County has taken the lead in career and economic education. However, to insure this lead, steps must continually be taken to cultivate and maintain collaborative efforts between educators and other community groups.

Other Substantive Issues Raised by Participants

Each of the three seminars found participants discussing a number of substantive issues in career education not necessarily directly tied to the concept of collaboration itself. Each was, however, a set of understandings valuable for those concerned about career education collaborative efforts. Thus, a number of these issues are summarized in this portion of the monograph.

When the kinds of brief descriptions presented here are coupled with further reports from the 31 additional seminars in this series—each designed to provide operational example of career education collaborative efforts in action—it should be clear that the concept of collaboration in career education has advanced beyond the stage of initial conceptualization. Some action has already begun.

What is "Meaningful" Experience for Youth in a Collaborative Career Education Effort?

One excellent illustration of differing perceptions between educators and business/labor/industry representatives occured when the question listed as the topic for this section was raised by seminar participants. Here, these perceptual differences and the extent to which they were resolved will be briefly described.

The key controversies resolved around the definition of "meaningful experiences." In general, the business/industry participants seemed to interpret the term to mean experiences that would allow youth to learn what it would ***really*** be like if he/she were employed in a particular occupation. Education-based seminar participants tended to interpret the term to mean any experience which enabled youth to gain what, for them, was valuable new knowledge. The lone representative from organized labor emphasized the importance of interpreting the term to mean experiences in which youth learn about the reality of working conditions.

Specifically, the business/industry seminar participants raised questions related to productivity of youth in the workplace as part of work experience collaborative efforts. They pointed out that, operationally, it is impractical for industry to make youth responsible, in a very brief period of time, for, say, actually installing a telephone that a real customer would expect to use. Yet, without that level of experiencing, they questioned whether or not youth will really learn what the job of the telephone installer is like. Second, industry representatives pointed out that, if, in a "youth enrichment experience" as part of a collaborative effort, one provided work experience for youth under conditions that either: (a) displaced a currently employed worker; or (b) kept a currently unemployed worker from returning to her/his job, industry is in trouble with their unions. Reservations were expressed on both counts.

The seminar representative from organized labor, on the other hand, emphasized the importance, in a youth work experience effort, of helping youth discover answers to such routine, but important, matters as: (a) how to use a time clock; (b) what's a break and what rules exist for it; (c) to what extent do workers have to obey the boss: and (d) how do employees cope with pressures from other workers to behave in particular ways? He pointed out that, for many youth, it would take very little time for them to fully understand that many routine assembly line jobs are dull and lacking in intrinsic motivation but, still, many of today's youth will, as adults, take such jobs in which schools have, to date, done a poor job in readying youth for such positions.

He (the seminar member from organized labor) also made a very good point by stressing that, by emphasizing preparation for productive use of leisure time so much more than preparation for factory jobs, many schools today do a far better job in preparing youth for *unemployment* than for *employment.*

Educators who were members of the seminar insisted that the term "meaningful work experience" is one that must, in the long run, be defined by youth themselves. They emphasized the fact that the process of occupational decisionmaking does not always have to be involved in order for a particular work experience to be "meaningful" to a particular youth. Instead, many youth will find it "meaningful" simply to actually see, for example, factory work being performed, to visit with workers about their occupations and life-styles, or to physically observe the interdependence of workers in a real work setting.

Several seminar participants emphasized the importance of looking to public service jobs, as well as the private sector, in seeking environments in which youth can obtain meaningful work experience. There seemed to be general agreement that both settings are important to consider.

The controversy raised by this question seemed to resolve itself when all seminar participants started looking at the challenge of a collaborative career education effort in terms of the career development process, as opposed to the specific occupational decisionmaking process. Viewed from the standpoint of career development, a wide variety of "meaningful" experiences for youth in the business/labor/industry setting are possible ranging all the way from career awareness through career exploration to actual occupational decisionmaking. A collaborative career education effort is one that will accommodate this entire range of expected student needs and will include both elementary and secondary school age youth.

Career Education and Economic Education: Do They Fit In a Collaborative Effort?

For many years, groups such as the Joint Council on Economic Education have been engaged in securing the active involvement of persons from the business/industry community in assuring that school-age youth acquire basic economic understandings. Because both educators and members of the business/industry community are involved in such efforts, the question logically arose among seminar participants of relationships between career education and economic education. Answers given by seminar participants to this question are summarized here.

First, it was emphasized that "economics" can be and is taught as a subject in the curriculum of many high schools now. To whatever extent economics is regarded as a subject included in the curriculum then teachers of economics should be asked to infuse career education concepts into that subject just as other teachers are being asked to do.

Second, "economic education" is a term that extends considerably beyond the teaching of economics as a subject matter area. There are at least two other dimensions to the term "economic education" that hold great implications for career education. One of these has to do with teaching youth economic "survival skills" required for effective living in today's society (such as how to balance a checkbook, how to secure a loan, what's a mortgage, and how one calculates the real amount it costs to buy things on time). Such "personal economics skills" can be seen as a way of pulling together other career education skills (such as self-understanding, world of work, decisionmaking, and job-seeking skills) into a total pattern related to the youth's expected lifestyle. There seemed to be general consensus among seminar participants that such "personal economics skills" should be considered an essential part of a total career education effort.

The other part of "economic education" seminar participants seemed to agree was needed was what one participant called "descriptive economics." The term "descriptive economics" was viewed as including helping youth find answers to questions such as: (a) what are banks and what roles do they play in our lives? (b) what's made in our town–and where do we get things we need that arent's made here? (c) how are business decisions affecting our community made? and (d) what's the local job scene like for youth and for adults where we live? Again, there seemed to be general consensus among seminar participants that "descriptive economics" represented an essential body of knowledge that should be included in a total career education experience.

The question came closest to being answered when seminar participants realized that neither "career education" or "economic education" were properly regarded as "subjects" to be added to the curriculum. Rather, "career education," as a concept, seeks to emphasize the desirability of helping youth acquire and utilize a variety of skills–including skills embodied both in "economic survival" and in "descriptive economics"–required for making work a meaningful part of their total lifestyle. To the extent that "economic education" adopts a strategy that calls for a combination of infusion into existing subject matter coupled with experiential learning in the business/labor/industry community, then it can and should be considered an integral part of the total career education effort. On the other hand, those advocates of "economic education" that see it as a separate course to be added to the curriculum are seen as having no greater career education responsibilities than do teachers of any other separate subject.

Career Education and the "Back to Basics" Movement: Do They Fit Together?

Participants in the third seminar pointed out that, in many communities, the call for a "back to basics" movement is receiving at least as much attention as is the call for education to improve its effectiveness in helping youth prepare for work. They spend considerable time discussing how these two kinds of community calls for change in education can be fitted together rather than being regarded as choices for school boards and school administrators to make.

There were two basic grounds on which participants based their contention that career education and "back to basics" can be answered, in part, by a community collaborative career education effort. First, one of the reasons many students aren't learning the basic skills is that they haven't been shown how to *apply* such skills in the real world. By showing students how adults use the basic skills in their work, students may benefit if a "doing to learn" is combined with a "learning to do" approach to the teaching/learning process. By using community resources in career education, experimental learning opportunities can be coupled with cognitive learning in ways that may help students learn the basic skills better. In both of these ways, career education can serve as a *vehicle* for increasing pupil learning of the basic skills. Advocates of career education and of the "back to basics" movement should, if this rationale is used, be supportive of each other.

At the same time, participants pointed out that it would be a serious error in strategy to contend that career education is *the* answer to the "back to basics" problem. No participant contended that, only through career education, could the "back to basics" problem be solved. Career education is properly pictured as *one among several* possible approaches to consider by those interested in educational change that will increase pupil mastery of the basic academic skills.

Finally, participants emphasized that it would be an equally serious error in strategy if career education advocates were to picture themselves as solidly behind all of those currently calling for a "back to basics" approach to educational change. Several participants pointed out that the term "basic skills" is one that finds very wide interpretation in meaning. Further, some of those calling for "back to basics" have a philosophical orientation quite different from that of career education advocates in terms of their basic concern for protecting individual freedom of choice and helping individuals enhance what, for them, will be a personally meaningful lifestyle.

Concluding Remarks

This monograph represents an attempt to summarize the thoughts, opinions, and experiences of those persons listed in Appendix A. Readers will note that these persons come from very diverse segments of the formal education system and the broader business/labor/industry community. In this sense, the monograph, itself, can be regarded as a "collaborative" effort. At the same time, it is important to point out that most of the actual content was written by an educator, not a person representing the broader community. Because of this, there is, undoubtedly, an unfortunate educational bias here that has colored this presentation. It cannot be helped.

The monograph has attempted to explain and describe the meaning of "collaboration" as that term is currently being used in career education. It may well be that "collaboration" is the wrong word; i.e., that some other word such as "coalition" or "partnership" would be a better one to use. It is the concept, not the word, that is important to emphasize. Hopefully, these words have made some contribution toward providing such an emphasis.

APPENDIX A

Participants

David D. Amerman
Director of Career Education
Livonia Schools
1525 Farmington Road
Livonia, Michigan 48154

Richard Arnold
Manager, Educational Relations
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
195 Broadway
New York, New York 10007

Elvis Arterbury
3700 Rose Avenue
Box 193
Dallas, Texas 75204

Anita Barber
Alabama State Department
of Education
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Paul Barton
National Manpower Institute
1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ellen Boyers
Director, Career Guidance
Institutes
National Alliance of Businessmen
1730 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Willard Cheek
Manager, Educational Relations
Public Relations Staff
General Motors Corporation
3044 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Donald Clark, President
National Association for
Industry-Education Cooperation
235 Hendricks Boulevard
Buffalo, New York 14226

Albert Glassman
Executive Director, Career Education
School District of Philadelphia
734 Schuylkill
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146

Edwin Herr
Department of Counselor Education
The Penn State University
323 Social Science Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Sharlene Hirsch
Executive High School Internships
of America
473 Jackson Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

Catherine Hopkins
Coordinator of Career Education
Curriculum Center
31 Eliza Street
Worcester, Massachusetts 01605

Myrtle Hunt
Director of Career Education
3230 9th Avenue, South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33712

Andy Jacobs
Executive Director, IPAR
516 S.E. Morrison Street
Suite 710
Portland, Oregon 97214

Bruce Kingery
International Representative
Education Department
AW International Union
8000 East Jefferson
Detroit, Michigan 48214

Jeffrey Kleinberg
Assistant Dean of Students
LaGuardia Community College
of CUNY
Long Island City, NY 11101

Mary Kohler
National Commission on Resources
for Youth
36 West 44th Street
New York, New York 10036

Nancy Losekamp
Upper Arlington Public Schools
1915 North Mallway
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Frances Lowe
Director, Project Open Doors
20 West 40th Street
New York, New York 10018

Norman Malbin
Greater Portland
Work-Education Council
710 S.W. 2nd-5th Street
Portland, Oregon 97204

Sidney Marland, President
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Howard Marshall
McCormick Spice Company
414 Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

George Lulos
Director of Career Education
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Bernard Murchland
Professor of Philosophy
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43105

Irv Moskowitz
Principal
Career Education Center
2650 Eliot
Denver, Colorado 82211

Linda Pfister
Program Service Officer
Career Skills Assessment Program
The College Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Barbara Preli
Director, Career Education
Jefferson County Public Schools
Brown Education Center
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Carolyn Raymond
Director of Career Education
Mesa Public Schools
549 North Stapley Drive
Mesa, Arizona 85202

Joe Richards
Director of Vocational,
Career Education
440 East 100 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Don Schurr
Mid-Michigan Community Action
Council
Box 102
Alma, Michigan 48801

Robert Taylor
Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Nick Topougis
Akron Public Schools
70 North Broadway
Akron, Ohio 44308

Vincent Troiano
Deputy Administrator Career
Education
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Ernest Upthegrove
1450 Northeast 2nd Avenue
Room 210 HOV
Miami, Florida 33132

Grant Venn
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

Hank Weiss
Industry-Education Council of
California
1575 Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, California 94010

Jeanne Werschke
Colorado Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dean Wertz
Director, Vocational Education
Bloom Township High School
Dixie Highway and 10th Street
Chicago Heights, Illinois 60411

APPENDIX B

Issues Raised by Participants

1. How to coordinate the wide variety of community resources (e.g., public schools, community colleges, Explorers, Rotary, etc.) that should be involved in collaboration.

2. How not to "oversell" or "burn out" community resources.

3. Is "partnership" a better term than "collaboration"–i.e., "collaboration," to some, carries implications of "collusion."

4. How to help educators say *specifically* what they want from B/L/I community.

5. How to translate national corporate policy statements into local action efforts.

6. The need for *school* (as well as industry) policy statements on collaboration.

7. Need to specify *what* the B/L/I community can do in the classroom.

8. How to establish and use a central source for collaboration for educators to call.

9. Need for career education specialists to make collaboration "happen."

10. How do we create a *climate for collaboration*?

11. How can B/L/I be shown what education has already done in collaboration?

12. How can a permanent mechanism for collaboration be established?

13. What is the role and prospects for simulation in collaboration?

14. How can a *system* for collaboration be established?

15. How can organized labor be more effectively involved in collaboration?

16. How can the image of participants from B/L/I be protected when collaboration is implemented?

17. How can we avoid creating a career education "empire?"–i.e., a separate *program*?

18. How to answer the "What's in it for me?" question for all involved in collaboration.

19. How to "share and steal" ideas for collaboration.

20. How to involve youth themselves more directly in collaboration.

21. The variety of people in career education makes for different "dialects," if not for different "languages"–how can all involved communicate with each other?

22. How to effectively involve small business in collaboration.

23. How to be realistic with youth in a collaborative effort.

24. How much can you ask of the B/L/I community in collaboration?

25. To whom does career education belong?

26. What is the relationship of career education to economic education, vocational education, and so forth?

27. How can more Federal support for career education be generated while still keeping its definition loose and flexible?

28. What is collaboration supposed to accomplish?

29. What are the implications of collaboration for the structural reform of education?

30. How can both business and organized labor agree on a way of justifying *real* work by youth in career education when no pay is involved?

31. How to think of the end product as concentrating on youth *development* rather than simply youth *jobs*–i.e., "lifestyle" instead of "paid employment."

32. How can youth be given *meaningful* work experiences—i.e., experiences that have some *responsibility* associated with them?

33. What are the implications of dependence on a healthy business economy as a necessary condition to assure industry's *continuing* participation in career education collaborative efforts?

34. What's the difference between "collaboration" and "cooperation?"

35. How will education sustain collaboration after initial industry participation—i.e., won't schools eventually have to assume ongoing responsibility?

36. How can industry be convinced to engage in collaborative efforts in the face of a shrinking new youth labor market?

37. How does collaboration work in community colleges vs. K-12 school districts?

38. How can collaboration help meet the need for training of paraprofessionals?

39. How can the community become involved in guidance and counseling as part of a community collaborative career education effort?

40. Does collaboration extend beyond youth to the concept of lifelong learning?

41. What does the B/L/I community see as relationships between liberal arts education and career education?

42. What do we mean by "work?" by "career?"

43. What will be the nature of work in the currently-emerging society?

44. Are there *really* two worlds—"world of work" and "world of education?" Does any person belong to only one of these "worlds?" How can the artificual walls between these two "worlds" be broken down?

45. How can B/L/I become true partners in collaboration on a continuing basis?

46. How can we move from a horizontal level to a joint decisionmaking effort in implementing collaboration at the local level?

47. What specific action steps are involved in implementing collaboration?

48. How can all educators be sensitized to the fact that the need for community collaborative career education efforts will be a continuing, rather than a short-term one?–i.e., youth employment problems will be here for a long time.

49. How can one demonstrate the need for collaboration while admitting that this effort cannot create youth jobs?

50. Should career education collaboration always start with youth concerns?

51. How do we organize for collaboration? How do we involve the power structure at the local level? Who's involved? How big a geographic area can be covered?

52. Should B/L/I be supporting collaboration financially?

53. Does community collaboration work best if pictured to the B/L/I community as extending beyond career education?

54. What are the priorities for implementing collaboration at the local level (e.g., should staff development get top priority.)?

55. How can we get a policy statement on collaboration stated in three phases: (a) to determine the state of the art; (b) to conceptualize the model; and (c) to articulate ways in which the model can be implemented?

56. How can we get a *sustaining* collaborative effort at the nation State, and local levels?

57. How can we get an *internal*, continuing commitment of industry to career education with hard money behind it?

58. Is it possible to develop a transportable (adaptable) model for career education collaboration or must each community "discover the wheel" for itself?

59. Why is collaboration needed?

60. How do we establish an atmosphere of trust and respect across various segments of the community who must be involved in career education collaboration?

61. How can the collaboration "marriage" continue after the "honeymoon" is over?

62. How can real community representation and participation be assured in career education collaboration efforts?

63. How can bias and prejudice against minorities and women be overcome through a community collaborative career education effort—including bias against youth?

64. What are the pros and cons of including "enemies" as well as "friends" of career education on a community career education council?

65. How can teachers be motivated and taught to use community resources?

66. How can community collaboration be extended beyond large industries to include both middle sized businesses and the small business operations?

67. How can the education system get organized internally in ways that make a central contact point for the B/L/I community?

68. How, and to what extent, should the B/L/I community participate in educational policy making and/or decision making as part of collaboration?

69. How can B/L/I persons who control funds be encouraged to use them for a broad career education effort (rather than only a small part such as economic education)?

70. How can collaboration most effectively include organized labor?

71. How can collaboration be handled in ways that involve high quality B/L/I persons and avoid the use of overenthusiastic, biased, uninformed persons?

72. How can the current "back to basics" movement be used to the advantage, rather than the disadvantage, of educators in encouraging career education efforts?

73. What kind of staff is needed to do collaboration and how can staffing be adequately accomplished?

74. How can dollars needed for career education collaboration be obtained when other educational priorities are mandated and career education is not?

75. How can *internal* collaboration within education be effectively accomplished?

76. How can we avoid "burning out" good B/L/I resources for collaboration?

77. How can the resources of multiple communities be used to make collaboration work in a single rural school district?

78. How can the "What's in it for me?" psychology of the B/L/I community be dealt with?

79. How can community stereotypes be broken down so that a true community collaborative effort can be mounted?

80. How can a collaborative effort be put on a sustaining, rather than a temporary project basis?

81. Can and should a single community resource center to be used in all kinds of collaborative efforts (including career education) be established?

82. Is there danger of duplication of effort between NMI education/work councils and career education advisory councils?

83. How can people be trained (educated) to engage in collaboration?

84. How can the concept of collaboration be properly promoted as only one aspect of career education?

85. Are there collaboration "myths" that should be exposed and exploded?

86. How can the variety of ways in which community resources are used for collaboration be expanded?

87. How can a systematic "how-to-do-it" approach to collaboration be formulated and used?

88. How can communications be made between *operational persons* in B/L/I community after top policy makers have agreed that collaboration should exist?

89. How can B/L/I agree on a common set of product and process goals for collaboration?

90. How can school guidance services be most effectively included in collaboration?

91. Are different guidelines for collaboration needed for different segments of the community?

92. To what extent are organizational by-laws of some community groups (Chamber of Commerce, for example) preventing their participation in a total community collaborative effort?

93. How and what kinds of hard data are needed to justify continuing collaborative career education efforts?

94. Will a "Federal push" for collaboration help or hurt local collaborative initiative?

GPO 932-800